

Serial No.: 10/082,536

REMARKS

These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the office action are shown indented and italicized.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 42, 46 and 47 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of previous claim. - Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 42, 46 and 47 describe a computer usable medium having computer readable program code to affect the function/steps of Claims 1 and 30. The Examiner submits that placing the methods of Claims 1 and 30 (Claims 1 and 30 performs the same functions) does not further limit the claims. The methods/functions of the two claims would be accomplished regardless of the medium the instructions were stored upon.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that in order to overcome the objections, Beauregard type claims 42 and 47 are amended to become independent claims. Claim 46 is amended to put it in so called 'proper form'. Thus claims 42, 46 and 47 are allowable.

Claim 9 objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 9 is shown as dependent on the withdrawn claim 5. It was suggested that the dependency is to claim 3. Appropriate correction is required.

In response, the applicants respectfully states that claim 9 is amended to depend on claim 3 rather than claim 5.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

16/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg U.S. Patent 6,879,963 B1 (Rosenberg).

In response, the applicants respectfully states that the present invention provides "methods and apparatus to protect user privacy while accessing information in public places, using both public and personal devices. This is achieved by employing a mechanism that prevents private information from being displayed on public devices. Instead, this type of information is made available only to a user's personal device(s) that the user carries and/or trusts. An example embodiment of the invention shows relevant parts of the information content, referred to also as information documents or simply documents, to multiple devices based on privacy level and user preferences. Embodiments of the present invention also provide personalized services based on privacy levels defined by users. These users can for example be customers of a retail store. The service provided is sometimes also based on user history of accessing information documents. It permits personalized information to be sent to a customer's personal device."

Thus the present invention claimed in claims 1-4, and 30, splits information received in response to a user's query and forms a first portion and at least one other portion of the information, in order to be able to provide the advantages of the present invention.

The cited reference to Rosenberg, U.S. Patent 6,879,963, was filed: April 12, 2000, and is entitled, "Cross channel delivery system and method." The abstract of Rosenberg reads,

Methods and systems consistent with the present invention provide a cross channel fulfillment system that enables consumers to purchase and receive items using different transmission mediums. The fulfillment system is a centralized distribution system that maintains information relating to consumers and has access to multiple transmission mediums. Specifically, the fulfillment system contains a database of consumer contact information relating to each transmission medium. The fulfillment system uses a remote device to provide information to consumers. The remote device transmits and receives

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

17/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

broadcast messages including information relating to purchasable items. The fulfillment system may deliver a purchased item to the consumer using a medium different from that used to purchase the item.

Thus, Rosenberg is concerned with cross channel delivery of items purchased. Rosenberg does not split any information content to form a first portion and at least one other portion of the information. Rosenberg's remote device transmits and receives broadcast messages including information relating to purchasable items. The fulfillment system may deliver a purchased item to the consumer using a medium different from that used to purchase the item. The message of the purchased item delivered is not split from information received.

Therefore, applicants respectfully state that claims 1-4, and 30 are not made obvious by Rosenberg.

As per claims 1 and 30: Rosenberg discloses: routing a first portion of information to a first device and at least one other portion of information to at least one other device in response to a user's query, said method including: for example Col. 4, lines 10-40. Receiving said query and identifying said users meeting a first identification criterion, for example Col. 3, lines 15-30. Forming identification when said first identification criterion is met; for example Col. 3, lines 30-45. Forwarding said first portion of information to said first device and said at least one other portion of information to said at least one other device, for example Col. 4, lines 12-55. Rosenberg discloses the claimed invention except for employing said identification informing said first portion of information and said at least one other portion of information. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to employ said identification in forming said first portion of information and said at least one other portion of information since it is known in the art that during a transaction, the identification established for the buyer is incorporated into all the actions of the transaction such that verification can be done on the actions taken typing them together with a common identifying number unique to the transaction.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that claims 1 and 30 are not anticipated or made obvious by Rosenberg. Rosenberg apparently discloses the use of separate media of communication between a consumer and the seller of digital items (movies, music, books, etc.) to communicate entirely different portions of a purchase transaction process. Fig. 1 and its details in Figs. 2 and 3 and corresponding explanations in Columns 3 and 4 (including the portions cited by

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

18/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

the examiner) in Rosenberg, clearly show that Rosenberg considers a first communication phase that use a first communications medium (or channel as Rosenberg uses) where purchasable digital items are broadcast to a user and a user uses to place an order for them. Then, during a second communication phase, which is temporally separate from the first communication phase, a second communication medium is used to deliver (or to fulfill as Rosenberg states) the purchased digital item to the consumer. While we do agree with the examiner that Rosenberg uses two media to communicate separate components of a single transactions, the information conveyed in these components are absolutely of different kind ((a) a purchase order for a digital item, and then (b) the purchased digital item itself), that are supposed to be transmitted separately under any circumstance and they were never part of a single communicable entity (e.g., a purchase order for a song has absolutely no informational coherency (including its formatting and encoding) with the actual "contents" of the song). These pieces of information and the corresponding transmissions are strictly temporally separated and the second component (the purchased digital item) can be communicated only after the first component has been communicated and processed (by the fulfillment system). This is further emphasized in claim 1 of Rosenberg where the second client device is only referenced with respect to the fulfillment of a purchase (see Col.7 lines 7-9 and lines 13-21).

Thus, Rosenberg does not make the present claims obvious. Although not necessary, in order to better clarify the present invention, claim 1 is amended to includes a step of providing information responsive to a user's query, said information having a first portion and at least one other portion and more specifically show that the information is split into the first portion an at least one other portion. These steps are not disclosed or even implied by Rosenberg, because Rosenberg never considers the (splitting and) routing of a different portions of the same information content (e.g., different portions of the same Web page, or different portions of the same song) to different devices using different communications media at the same time, or in no necessarily fixed order. This is a fundamental difference between Rosenberg and the applicants' invention and it would not be obvious for those skilled in the art to develop an embodiment of the applicants' invention based on Rosenberg's teachings.

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

19/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

Furthermore, in Rosenberg, the fulfillment system contains a database of consumer contact information relating to each transmission medium. This is not the case with the devices in claims 1 and 30. Also, the portions of information that are routed to the at least two devices are not required to have a temporal relationship with each other as is the case with Rosenberg. In claims 1 and 30, the forwarding of first and at least one other portion requires no persistent and/or predetermined order.

Claim 30 is amended consistent with the amendment of claim 1. Thus, the applicants respectfully state that claims 1 and 30 and all claims that depend thereupon, especially as are further amended, are allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 2: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said step of identifying is performed by an identifier, and step of employing is performed by a respondent server. For example Col. 3, lines 2-30.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 2 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. Thus claim 2 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 2 is dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 3: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said first device is a user device employed in making said query, and said step of identifying includes identifying said user device employing identification criteria. For example Col. 3, lines 25-35.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 3 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. Thus claim 3 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 3 is dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 4: Rosenberg further discloses: A method as recited in claim 3, wherein one of said identification criteria is a criterion selected from a group of criteria including: identifying a device identification; identifying a device group identification; identifying a user identification, identifying a user group identification; authenticating user of said device by user Identification and password; employing a verification

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

20/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

signature included in said query; employing an RFID Tag; employing a 3rd party mechanism; and any combination of said criterion. For example Col. 3, lines 25-45.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that claim 4 is not anticipated, alluded to or made obvious by Rosenberg. Rosenberg apparently discloses the use of different means to identify individuals. Specifically, a review of the cited portion of Rosenberg, as well as of the claims in Rosenberg, indicates that the identification of groups is not disclosed by Rosenberg who only considers identification of individuals. Group identification is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 4 is not obvious. Furthermore, claim 4 is dependent on claim 3 and ultimately on claim 1, and is allowable over the cited art in itself and because it is dependent on allowable claim 1.

As per claim 7: Rosenberg further discloses: comprising a first entity supplying said first device to a user. For example Col. 3, lines 10-15.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 7 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. Thus claim 7 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 7 is dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 8: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said first entity is a business and said user is a customer. For example Col. 3, lines 10-15.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that claim 8 is not anticipated, alluded to or made obvious by Rosenberg. Although Rosenberg apparently uses the concepts of a business (the operators of the electronic store that sells the digital items) and customers (the consumer), claim 8 is still allowable over the cited art. Specifically, a review of the cited portion of Rosenberg, as well as of the claims in Rosenberg, indicates that the businesses considered by Rosenberg are of a single and very specific type, businesses that sell digital items (which can thus be sent electronically to consumers), and consumers that purchase these digital items from a consumer location, i.e., their residence. While Rosenberg does not explicitly mentions that a consumer's

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

21/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

location is his/her residence, the embodiments provided and the implications from them do not support a consumer location other than a residence. Use of non-digital item companies (as well as the use of consumer locations other than residences) is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 8 is not obvious. Furthermore, claim 8 is dependent on claim 7 and ultimately on claim 1, and is allowable over the cited art in itself and because it is dependent on allowable claim 1.

As per claim 9: Rosenberg further discloses: said user employing said first device in a session; and associating said user for said session employing said verification. For example Col. 3, lines 15-35.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 9 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. Thus claim 9 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 9 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 10: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said respondent server is also said identifier, for example Col. 4, lines 40-55.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 10 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg apparently does not reveal that Rosenberg discloses that the respondent server can also serve as the said identifier as stated in claim 10. Instead, apparently Rosenberg simply states that the fulfillment system (which represents the respondent server in Rosenberg) has a software that checks whether the consumer is authorized to purchase a purchasable item (Col. 4, lines: 44-46). Allowing for the respondent server to also be an identifier is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 10 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 10 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

22/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

As per claim 11: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said step of receiving said query [and identifying said user's meeting a first identification criterion, includes at least one step from a group of steps including: user pre-registering query; utilizing user criteria; selecting a hyper-link; sending mail. For example Col. 4, lines 30-45.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 11 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg apparently does not indicate that Rosenberg discloses that receiving a query includes at least one of the steps stated in claim 11. Instead, apparently Rosenberg simply states that the client device has a receiver program that is capable to receive the purchased digital item through means different than those used to place the order for the item. One of these means could be an e-mail application (Col. 4, lines: 35-39). However, in Rosenberg's case this software resides at the consumer's location with the objective to receive the purchased digital item. In the applicants' invention, it is the consumer (in Rosenberg's parlance) that makes use of e-mail (or the other steps stated in claim 11) for sending a query, as oppose to receiving a response (the fulfillment of the order in Rosenberg). Allowing for the first identification criterion to include one step from the group of steps stated in claim 11 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 11 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 11 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 12: Rosenberg further discloses; wherein said first portion of information includes private user information and said at least one other portion of information includes public information. For example Col. 3, lines 12-25.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 12 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 12. Specifically, apparently Rosenberg does not indicate that public and private information is provided to the consumer, and even more so on separate devices, as is the case in the applicants' invention where a first and at

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

23/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

least one other portion of information is routed to different devices. Allowing for the sending of private and public portions of information as stated in claim 12 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 12 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 12 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 13: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein content included in said first portion of information and/or included in said at least one other portion of information is based on a preference criterion. For example Col. 5, lines 1-20.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 13 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 13. Specifically, Rosenberg does not indicate the use of a preference criterion according to which any (or all) parts of the information provided to the customer (through at least two devices) is based upon. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 13 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 13 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 13 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 14: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said preference criterion is a criterion selected from a group of criteria including: security level; user profile; user data; user history; preferred customer status; user affiliation; user service level association; time of day; day of year. religion; ethnic background; national background; gender; sexual orientation; demographic information; context; inventory, classification level; and any combination of the above criterion. For example for example Col. 5, lines 1-15.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 14 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 14. Specifically, Rosenberg does not indicate the use of any preference criterion related to the group of criteria stated in claim 14.

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

24/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 14 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 14 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 14 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 15: Rosenberg further discloses: changing preference criteria dynamically, For example Fig. 5.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 12 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 15. Specifically, Rosenberg does not indicate the dynamic change of preference criteria. Fig. 5 depicts a flow chart of the steps performed by the fulfillment system and neither Fig. 5 nor the description of the fulfillment system indicates the use of any preference criterion or implies any possibility of changing them. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 15 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 15 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 15 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 16: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said step of changing preference criteria is performed dynamically during a session. For example Fig. 5.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 16 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 16. Specifically, Rosenberg does not indicate the dynamic change of preference criteria during a session. Fig. 5 depicts a flow chart of the steps performed by the fulfillment system and neither Fig. 5 nor the description of the fulfillment system indicates the use of any preference criterion or implies any possibility of changing them during a session. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 16 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

25/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 16 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 16 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 17: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein preference criteria change dynamically during a session by user. For example Fig. 5.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 17 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 17. Specifically, Rosenberg does not indicate the dynamic change of preference criteria during a session by a user. Fig. 5 depicts a flow chart of the steps performed by the fulfillment system and neither Fig. 5 nor the description of the fulfillment system indicates the use of any preference criterion or implies any possibility of changing them during a session by a user. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 17 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 17 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 17 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 18: Rosenberg further discloses; forming a user profile database for a plurality of users. For example Col. 5, lines 15-45.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 18 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 18. Specifically, the cited portion of Rosenberg apparently does not indicate the use of a user (or consumer in Rosenberg parlance) profile. Thus claim 18 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 18 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 19: Rosenberg further discloses; forming a user profile database for a plurality of users based on said preference criteria. For example Col. 5 lines 15-45,

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

26/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 19 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 19. Specifically, the cited portion of Rosenberg explains Fig. 5 which provides a flow chart of the steps performed by the fulfillment system and there is no indication that there is a formation of a database using user profiles based on any preference criteria. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 19 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 19 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 19 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 20: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said step of forming is repeated in accordance with a database update criterion. For example Col. 5, lines 15-45.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that a typographical error in claim 20 is corrected making it depend upon claim 18 rather than claim 16. Applicants take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 20 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 20. Specifically, the cited portion of Rosenberg explains Fig. 5 which provides a flow chart of the steps performed by the fulfillment system and there is no indication that there is a formation of a database using user profiles based on any preference criteria and any database update criterion. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 20 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 20 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 20 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 21: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said database update criterion is a criterion selected from a group of criteria including: change of preference criteria by user; change of identification criteria; information, access; change of context; and any combination of the above criterion, For example Col. 5, lines 15-35.

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

27/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 21 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 21. Specifically, the cited portion of Rosenberg explains Fig. 5 which provides a flow chart of the steps performed by the fulfillment system and there is no indication that there is a database update process based on any of the criteria mentioned in claim 21. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 21 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 21 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 21 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 22: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said step of forming an identification when said first Identification criterion is met, includes; identifying user; and associating said user with said user profile. For example Col. 5, Lines 15-35.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 22 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 22. Specifically, the cited portion of Rosenberg apparently does not indicate the step of "forming an identification when said first Identification criterion is met, including identifying user and associating said user with said user profile." Thus claim 22 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 22 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 23: Rosenberg further discloses; wherein said step of forming an identification when said first identification criterion is met, includes: identifying user; associating said user with said identification criterion: for example Col. 5, lines 15-25.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 23 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 23. Specifically, the cited portion of Rosenberg explains Fig. 5 which provides a flow chart of the steps performed by the

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

28/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

fulfillment system and there is no indication that there is a step of forming an identification when some identification criterion is met and furthermore identifying a user and associating a user with the identification criterion as stated in claim 23. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 23 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 23 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 23 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 24: Rosenberg further discloses: wherein said step of forming an identification when said first identification criterion is met includes: associating said identification criterion with user profile. For example Col. 5, lines 14-34.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 24 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 24. Specifically, the cited portion of Rosenberg explains Fig. 5 which provides a flow chart of the steps performed by the fulfillment system and there is no indication that there is a step of associating an identification criterion with a user profile as stated in claim 24. Allowing for the latter as stated in claim 24 is an additional important distinguishing feature of the applicants' invention whose embodiment cannot be anticipated to those skilled in the art from Rosenberg's teachings. Thus claim 24 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 24 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 25: Rosenberg further discloses; wherein said step of employing said identification in forming said first portion of information and said at least one other portion of information, includes: creating rules for forming said first portion and said at least one other portion based on said preference criteria; For example Col. 3 lines 25-35, Col. 5, lines 1-35. Employing said rules to form said first portion and said at least one other portion; for example Col. 3, lines 25-35, Col. 5, lines 1-35.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 25 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the step of claim 25. Specifically, the cited portions

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

29/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536

refer to (a) the sending by a consumer of an instruction to the fulfillment system; (b) the composition of this instruction; and (c) the processing of the instruction at the fulfillment system. However there is no indication that information, which in the applicants' invention is sent to the user and not the other way as is the case with cited portion, has a step of employing an identification for forming a first and at least one other portion of information, according to rules that are based on preference criteria as stated in claim 25. The information that a customer receives in Rosenberg is either public (and hence no customizable according to any rules specific to a user) or "private" which is the digital item the customer purchased. However, the digital item comprises only a single portion of information and thus it cannot be customized according to any rules specific to a user in a first and at least one more portion as stated in claim 25. Thus claim 25 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 25 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As per claim 42: Rosenberg discloses: An article of manufacture comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program codes means embodied therein for causing information routing, the computer readable program code means in said article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps of claim 1. For example Col. 6, lines 24-35.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that they take exception with the inferred equivalence of claim 42 and the cited portions of Rosenberg. A review of the cited portion of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the steps of claim 42. Claim 42 represents an article of manufacture that effects the steps of claim 1, now made independent of claim 1. Thus claim 42 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 42 is ultimately dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

As with claim 1, claim 46 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg. Furthermore, claim 46 is dependent on allowable claim 1, and is also therefore allowable over the cited art.

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

30/31

Serial No.: 10/082,536


A review of Rosenberg indicates that it does not disclose the steps of claim 47. Claim 47 is a computer program product to effect the functions of claim 30, now made independent of claim 30. Thus as with claim 30, claim 47 is not made obvious by and is allowable over Rosenberg.

It is anticipated that this response brings all claims not withdrawn to allowance. If any questions remain, please call the undersigned representative.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
Reg. No. 41,500
Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194
Fax. (845) 352-3194

3 Cloverdale Lane
Monsey, NY 10952

Customer Number: 54856

DOCKET NUMBER: YOR200010762US1

31/31